

ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. I have just received notice of a motion for adjourning the business of the House for discussing a matter of urgent public importance, viz.,

"I move that the business of the House be adjourned for the day to discuss a matter of urgent public importance viz, the grave situation that has arisen out of the recent order of the Textile Commissioner regarding the retail distribution of textiles in the city and suburbs."

What is the recent order referred to by Mr. Parameswaran Pillai?

MR. G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha cum Shertala*): ടെക്സ്റ്റിൽ വിതരണത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് ഇപ്പോൾ കമ്മീഷണർ കൊടുത്തിരിക്കുന്ന ഉത്തരവുമൂലം ജനങ്ങൾക്കു തുണി വാങ്ങിക്കുന്നതിൽ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുള്ള വൈഷമ്യങ്ങളെ മൂങ്ങിക്കാണിക്കുന്നതിനാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ അടിയന്തിര പ്രമേയം കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളത്. ടെക്സ്റ്റിൽ കമ്മീഷണറുടെ ഉത്തരവ് ഒരു യൂണിറ്റിന് മുന്നിൽ ഒന്ന് വാർവിതം തുണിത്തരങ്ങൾ കൊടുക്കണം എന്നാണ്; അതായത് ൧൨ ഇഞ്ച്. ഇത്തരസരിച്ച പ്രായപൂർത്തി ഇല്ലാത്ത ഒരാൾക്ക് ൧൨ ഇഞ്ച്, പ്രായപൂർത്തിവന്ന ഒരാൾക്കിന് ൨൪ ഇഞ്ച് തുണിയാണ് കിട്ടാവുന്നത്. ഇതിന്റെ യുക്തിഹീനത മൂങ്ങിക്കാണിക്കേണ്ടത് ഏറ്റവും അത്യാവശ്യമാണ്.

PRESIDENT : Those in favour of discussing the adjournment motion today would please signify their assent.

The motion was declared carried by a majority.

Accordingly the motion was ordered to be moved for discussion at 3-30 p. m. for the day.

PRESIDENT : Order, order. Yesterday there was a motion for adjournment which was not permissible under the rules because the relations between this Government and the Government of British India and of the neighbouring State cannot be discussed on the floor of the House under our present Statute and Rules. Honourable members are aware, however, that from time to time in matters of important policy, it has been the programme of this Government to take this House and the Legislature completely into their confidence. Realising as they do that such matters cannot be discussed on the floor of the House, they nevertheless think that, the representatives of the people, should know the reasons actuating Government in their policy. In pursuance of this policy during many years, it has been the custom of the Head of the Administration to indicate to them the grounds of the action taken by Government even in matters not falling within the purview of this House's work under the Rules. The matter I shall deal with arises out of a statement made or rather a statement presented or placed before the Cochin Legislative Council. Normally speaking, this House and this

[President]

Government would have nothing to do with the work transacted by the Cochin Legislative Council, nor would they dream of interfering with or making any comment upon the policy or any action taken by the Ruler of a neighbouring State in regard to matters appertaining to his own State. It would not only be improper but wholly irregular on the part of any one in the State to detract from the complete jurisdiction of His Highness of Cochin with regard to Cochin and the affairs of Cochin. But when the Ruler of the Cochin State places a message before his Legislature necessarily affecting and involving Travancore and places that message without even having previously consulted the Travancore Government, or so far as I am aware, even the British Government, then the question arises whether this Government can allow that message to pass without recording their opinion. This Government therefore were obliged to indicate their opinion. But in order that there may be no misconception or misrepresentation on the matter, I shall categorically indicate the reasons for that opinion and the action taken by this Government. This Government have been and are all along willing to be a part of the All-India Union. This Government have through their Representative, who had the opportunity to meet the Cabinet Delegation, made it perfectly clear that they were quite willing to be a part of the Indian Union. They went further, not contenting themselves with the Congress position outlined by Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad and the very narrow jurisdiction vested in the Union relating to defence, communications and foreign affairs—they went further—in their willingness to grant jurisdiction to the Central Government. The Congress, having consented to the very narrow jurisdiction of the Union Government, has been endeavouring to wriggle, out of their previous position. Commentaries have been made by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru asserting interpretations of the expression, 'foreign affairs', which are obviously unacceptable. Foreign affairs, according to Pandit Nehru, include customs. The Cabinet Mission were not of that opinion. This Government definitely, through their representative, made it clear that they would like to have under the control of the Central Government, all matters of all-India importance, all-India planning, post-war reconstruction, customs, tariffs, food control, etc. All these this Government were willing to place in the control of the Central Government. In other words, this Government were willing to surrender their sovereignty to the Central Government or in favour of the Union to be, and all the powers, necessary for the efficient transaction of policies of an all-India basis. Such claims were resisted, and resisted very powerfully, by the Representatives of the Muslim League who wanted a very narrow construction to be placed upon this jurisdiction. The Representative of this Government definitely asked the Cabinet Delegation whether customs, planning and food will come within the powers of the Central Government. It was definitely stated to the Representative of this Government that such a construction was not permissible.

It was known to everybody in Delhi that this Government and many other Indian States, in fact a majority of the Indian States were willing to surrender their sovereignty to the Central Government in respect of most matters of all-India concern. For the purpose of political Compromise at that time, the Congress consented to a very restricted jurisdiction being conferred upon the all-India Union. Long before the present Cabinet Delegation started its work or even contemplated, this Government put themselves in touch with the Madras Government for the purpose of getting some kind of administrative co-ordination between Madras, and if possible, Mysore, Travancore, Cochin, and Pudukotta,—in other words, the whole of South India. A memorandum was prepared and was discussed with Sir Arthur Hope, the Governor of Madras. The underlying idea was that there should be no difficulty in matters of common concern in creating a consultative and co-ordinating body representing Madras, Travancore, Mysore, Cochin and Pudukotta. This Committee could meet once in two or three months to consider and by mutual agreement decide those questions. That matter was not pushed although His Excellency the Marquiss of Linlithgow was interested in the scheme. In the meantime the larger scheme had come to the point. So I want to make it perfectly clear that it has never been the intention of this Government to stand against the utmost possible co-operation not only with Cochin but with Madras and all other South Indian States whose atmosphere and background are similar and whose problems are cognate to each other. It was never the object of this Government to stand against the co-ordinated action and to bring into existence some kind of consultative committee for joint deliberation and decision.

This is a very different proposition to having a Kerala Province in which administrative jurisdiction over Travancore will be conferred upon the head of a contemplated Kerala Province comprising a British Indian District and two States. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari whose temper has outrun his Judgment has made a statement in which he states that it is very wise of the Ruler to put himself in the position of the Governor of a Province. The leading article in *the Hindu* has acclaimed the Cochin proposal as a rare act rather of self abnegation on the part of the Ruler. It is not my intention to criticise the act of the Ruler of a neighbouring State. But I want to make this perfectly clear so that there might be no difficulty or doubt in respect of this State. The Travancore Government do not propose to enter and will not enter into any discussion with anybody and do not propose at the instance of anybody to surrender its sovereignty in favour of a new Kerala administrative union which will combine the functions of the British Indian district of Malabar conducted on the basis of a particular system of Government, Cochin conducted on the basis of Cochin sovereignty and Travancore on the basis of Travancore sovereignty. It is not the

[President]

intention of the Travancore Government to surrender its sovereignty to any such union. This is not to say that this Government will not welcome, will not fully co-operate in any such scheme as I have already referred to. We have co-operated with Cochin with regard to food matters, in regard to the admission of students in the Engineering college, in forest matters, and on the question of coastal navigation, fertilisers and chemicals and the like. We shall undoubtedly be glad to co-operate with any neighbouring territory, but it is impossible for this Government to surrender its sovereignty in favour of a Union to be brought into existence for Kerala. There is no idea that the subjects of His Highness the Maharaja of Travancore should be subjected to the jurisdiction of the Governor of the Kerala Province. Their Highnesses of Travancore and Cochin should not in the opinion of this Government be in the position of obeying the directions of the Governor of the Kerala Province over and above cooperating with the Indian Union. Pandit Nehru has no doubt asserted that he will not allow independence of any sort to any State. The Cochin scheme involves a double subtraction of sovereignty, one in favour of the States and another in favour of the Government of the United Kerala. This is a proposition which this Government do not propose to accept, will not consent, and will resist at any cost.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know whether that matter is open to discussion?

PRESIDENT: There can be no discussion.

DEMAND XIII—FORESTS.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, I was yesterday pointing out my reasons as to why I am against the creation of a new Division. I submitted yesterday that sufficiently strong reasons have not been placed before the House by the Conservator for the creation of new Divisions. Also the scrutiny of the figures furnished by the Administration Report of the Forest Department for 1120 does not warrant the contentions put forward by him. Now, let us see what is the extent of the present Quilon Division and the work turned out in comparison with other Divisions. Are the area and the extent of work turned out in previous years of such a nature that it has been found practically impossible for one Division Officer to manage the whole division? If that is so, I am prepared to agree to the demand made by the Conservator yesterday. Again I ask, are the figures submitted in connection with the Northern Division such that it is practically impossible to carry out the work pertaining to that Division by one officer alone? And that is the question for us to consider. Now, the reasons, the pre-eminent reasons given by the Conservator of Forests, are these. There is going to be greater extraction of timber from the Quilon Division. There is going to be extraction of fuel coming to about 20 lakhs